Quantum Residual Correlation: Interpreting through State Merging

Indranil Chakrabarty,[1] Abhishek Deshpande,[2] and Sourav Chatterjee[3]

[1] *Center for Security, Theory and Algorithmic Research, International Institute of Information Technology, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, India.*
[2] *Dept. of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom.*
[3] *Center for Computational Natural Sciences and Bioinformatics, International Institute of Information Technology, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, India.*

In this brief report we revisit the concept of "quantum dissension", which was introduced as a natural extension of quantum discord for three qubit systems [16]. We introduce a new expression for quantum dissension called "residual correlation". This quantity captures the difference in the amount of correlation generated as a result of two particle and one particle projective measurement. In addition, we present an operational interpretation of this correlation in the context of state merging. We show that for a three qubit system, if one discards relevant prior information, the total change in the cost of state merging is captured by the residual correlation function. Further, we show that this quantity can be negative for certain states. This shows that for certain tripartite states one can reduce the cost of state merging by discarding relevant prior information.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1410.7067v2 [quant-ph] 3 Mar 2015

INTRODUCTION

For a long time, the study of quantum entanglement was only of foundational interest and the researchers were mainly addressing the questions that were related with the quantum mechanical understanding of various fundamental notions like reality and locality [1, 2]. However, for the last two decades we have seen that quantum entanglement is also a reality as far as the laboratory preparation of entangled qubits is concerned [3]. The research that was conducted during this period was not concerned about the existence of entangled qubits, but mostly about its usefulness as a resource to carry out information processing protocols like quantum teleportation [4], cryptography [5], superdense coding [6], remote state preparation [7], broadcasting of entanglement[8], quantum state merging [9] etc.

It is fairly easy to quantify the amount of quantum correlation present in a pure bipartite system. This is quantified by the amount of entanglement present in the system. There are certain standard measures, more specifically entanglement monotones like negativity [10] and concurrence [11, 12], quantifying the amount of entanglement for both pure as well as for mixed states. However, there are certain open issues in understanding the nature of correlations present in a mixed state, or a multi-qubit state. In addition, it is also not totally evident whether all the information-processing tasks that can be done more efficiently with quantum systems require entanglement as resource. There are several instances where even in the absence or near absence of entanglement one can carry out some information-processing tasks more efficiently [13]. A natural question to ask is if not entanglement, then what is responsible for such behavior. Researchers argued that the amount of correlation present in the composite system is not entirely captured by entanglement. They came up with different quantities for capturing the quantum correlation[14, 15]. One such measure based on information theoretic approach to quantify correlation is quantum discord [14, 15]. This aims to capture the non classical correlations present in a system, and more specifically that part of the correlation that cannot be witnessed with the standard measures of entanglement. These new measures are also extended for many qubit systems by adopting different approaches [16, 17]. In addition, we have geometric measures [18] to quantify the correlation in quantum mechanical systems.

A very important information processing task is quantum state merging [9]. In the classical setting state merging refers to the following scenario. Consider two parties Alice and Bob who wish to carry out some protocol. Bob has some prior information Y and the other party Alice has some missing information X (where X and Y are random variables). Here one asks a very simple question: If Bob wants to learn about X, how much additional information Alice needs to send him. It has been shown that only $H(X|Y)$ bits of information will suffice [19]. This quantity is known as the conditional entropy of X given that Y has occurred. This partial information that Alice needs to send to Bob is always a positive quantity, since classical information is always positive. In the context of quantum information, Alice and Bob each possess a system in some unknown quantum state with the total density operator being ρ_{AB}. The interesting case is where Bob is correlated with Alice, so that he has some prior information about her state. We ask how much additional quantum information Alice needs to send him, so that he has the full state. The amount of partial quantum information that Alice needs to send

Bob is given by the quantum conditional entropy, which is exactly the same quantity as in the classical case but with the Shannon entropy replaced by the Von Neumann entropy: $S(A|B) = S(A,B) - S(B)$. The notion of state-merging was extended to n-parties by Dutil and Hayden [20]. In another work, authors have given an operational interpretation of quantum discord based on the quantum state merging protocol [21]. Quantum discord was shown as the markup in the cost of quantum communication in the process of quantum state merging, if one discards relevant prior information.

In this work, we revisit the notion of "quantum dissension" which happens to be a multipartite extension of quantum discord. We introduce a new expression of quantum dissension called residual correlation. The basic motivation of introducing this quantity is to quantify the amount of extra correlation generated by doing two particle projective measurement instead of doing one particle projective measurement. In a sense it quantifies the residual or leftover part of correlation generated by a two particle measurement which is not captured by single particle measurement. In addition, we also give an operational interpretation of residual correlation in terms of state merging. We show that the total change in the cost of state merging is bounded by this residual correlation.

QUANTUM CORRELATION: BEYOND ENTANGLEMENT

The notion of quantum discord [14] has been generalized to three parties from different perspectives [16, 17]. One such way of extending quantum discord depending on the nature of projective measurement is called "Quantum Dissension" [16]. These are obtained by taking the difference of different expressions for mutual information that are not equivalent in quantum domain. The difference of these three definitions can capture various aspects of the quantum correlations. Let us consider a three-qubit state ρ_{ABC} where A, B and C refer to first, second and third qubit respectively.The initial quantum mutual information $\mathcal{I}_0(A:B:C)$ when no measurement is carried out is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_0(A:B:C) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_C) - [S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_{BC}) + S(\rho_{AC})] + S(\rho_{ABC}), \quad (1)$$

where $S(\rho)$ quantifies the Von neumann entropy of the state ρ. The final quantum mutual information $\mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C)$, obtained by carrying out one-particle projective measurement in the qubit B is given by,

$$\mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C) = S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_C) - S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}) - S(\rho_{AC}) - S(\rho_{BC}) + S(\rho_{ABC}) \quad (2)$$

Here $S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}) = \sum_j p_j S(\rho_{A|\pi_j^B}), \rho_{A|\pi_j^B} = \frac{\pi_j^B \rho_{AB} \pi_j^B}{Tr(\pi_j^B \rho_{AB})}$ and p_j is the probability of obtaining the j^{th} outcome. $S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B})$ is the average Von Neumann entropy of the qubit A, when the projective measurement is done on the subsystem B in the general basis $\{|u_1\rangle = \cos(\theta)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta)|1\rangle, |u_2\rangle = \sin(\theta)|0\rangle - \cos(\theta)|1\rangle\}$ (where $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$). Similarly, the final quantum mutual information $\mathcal{I}_2(A:B:C)$, obtained after bringing in the correlated system A with B and then carrying out the measurement, is given by,

$$\mathcal{I}_2(A:B:C) = [S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_C)] - [S(\rho_{CB}) + S(\rho_{CA})] + S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) \quad (3)$$

The two-particle projective measurement is performed in the general two qubit basis: $|v_1\rangle = \cos\theta|00\rangle + \sin\theta|11\rangle$, $|v_2\rangle = \sin\theta|00\rangle - \cos\theta|11\rangle$, $|v_3\rangle = \cos\theta|01\rangle + \sin\theta|10\rangle$, $|v_4\rangle = \sin\theta|01\rangle - \cos\theta|10\rangle$, where $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. In this case, $S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) = \sum_j p_j S(\rho_{C|\pi_j^{AB}})$ where p_j is the probability of j the outcome and $S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}})$ is the average von neumann entropy of the qubit C, when the projective measurement is done on qubits AB. It is interesting to note that because in principle there can be various expressions of mutual informations classically, we will have various definitions of quantum dissension. All these definitions capture various aspects of quantum correlation in the multiparty setting. They together establish the fact that quantum correlation is indeed a vector like quantity and each measure is an indicator of it's component.

Consider the difference of $\mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C)$ and $\mathcal{I}_0(A:B:C)$, i.e.

$$D_{1C}(A:B:C) = \mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C) - \mathcal{I}_0(A:B:C) = S(\rho_{AB}) - S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}). \quad (4)$$

The above expression must be minimized over all one-particle measurement projectors in order to reveal the quantum correlations. This dissension given by, $\delta_{1C} = \min_{\{\Pi_j\}}(D_{1C}(A:B:C))$. It gives the amount of quantum correlation generated as a result of carrying out a projective measurement on B. Similarly, one can consider the difference:

$$D_{2C}(A:B:C) = \mathcal{I}_2(A:B:C) - \mathcal{I}_0(A:B:C) = S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) + S(\rho_{AB}) - S(\rho_{ABC}) \quad (5)$$

By minimizing D_{2C} over all two-particle measurement projectors and obtain the dissension $\delta_{2C} = \min_{\{\Pi_j\}}(D_{2C}(A:B:C))$. This quantity gives the amount of quantum correlation generated by carrying out projective measurement on A and B both.

The third definition of quantum dissension that we introduce is given by the difference of $\mathcal{I}_2(A:B:C)$ and $\mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} D_{RC}(A:B:C) &= \mathcal{I}_2(A:B:C) - \mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C) \\ &= S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) - S(\rho_{ABC}) \\ &+ S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The above expression must be minimized over all θ. in order to reveal the maximum possible quantum correlations. Mathematically, this is $\delta_{RC} = \min_{\{\Pi_j\}}(D_{RC}(A:B:C))$. We call the quantity δ_{RC} as residual correlation. This is given by the difference in the amount of correlation generated in a system ρ_{ABC} as a result of single particle measurement on a qubit B from the correlation generated in the system by doing projective measurements on both qubits. In a sense this correlation can be viewed as the residual part left by subtracting one particle correlation from the correlation generated by two particle projective measurement.

Lemma 1. *Let ρ_{ABC} be a pure three qubit state. Then the residual correlation associated with this state is given by $\delta_{RC} = S(\rho_B) + \min_{\{\Pi_j\}}(S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}))$.*

Proof. For arbitrary pure three qubit state ρ_{ABC}, $S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) = 0$. This is because after measurement the system is in a product state of the state C and the projected state AB, which is a pure state. Also $S(\rho_{ABC}) = 0$ since it is a pure state. Therefore by equation 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{RC}(A:B:C) &= S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) - S(\rho_{ABC}) \\ &+ S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}). \\ &= S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Since $\delta_{RC} = \min_{\{\Pi_j\}}(D_{RC})$, we have $\delta_{RC} = S(\rho_B) + \min_{\{\Pi_j\}}(S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}))$.

□

Example 1. ***GHZ class states***
Consider the generalized GHZ (GHZ) states $|\psi_g\rangle$ given by,

$$|\psi_g\rangle = \cos(t)|000\rangle + \sin(t)|111\rangle. \tag{8}$$

Here the parameter t varies from 0 to 2π. From this we can always get back the well known GHZ state for $t = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

In Figure 1, we plot the residual correlation function against the input state parameter t and the measurement basis parameter θ.

Next we calculate the D_{RC} for the state $|\psi_G\rangle$ by carrying out both one particle and two particle measurements. In each of the two cases, these measurements are done in the most general basis. These bases are parametrized by azimuthal angle (θ).



FIG. 1: The Residual Correlation function D_{RC} of GHZ state is plotted against the input state parameter t and the basis parameter θ

Example 2. ***W states***
Next we consider the example of W state $|\psi_w\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|010\rangle+|001\rangle+|100\rangle)$ and plotted its residual correlation function D_{RC} against the measurement basis parameter θ in Figure 2.



FIG. 2: The Residual Correlation function D_{RC} of W state is plotted against the basis parameter θ

INTERPRETING RESIDUAL CORRELATION: A STATE MERGING PERSPECTIVE

In this section we give an operational interpretation of quantum residual correlation in terms of the total cost of state merging protocol required to merge the state of two parties onto a third party. Let us consider a hypothetical situation where we have three parties A, B and C. They share an ensemble of three qubit states ρ_{ABC} between themselves. Now if both A and C want to merge their information to B, the entire process can be carried out in the following steps.

- **Step I:** A sends the additional information to B. This is given by the quantity $S(A|B)$.
- **Step II:** C sends the additional information to B. Since B is already having A's information, the additional information is given by the quantity $S(C|A,B)$.
- **Step III:** The total cost of state merging in this scenario is given by $S(A|B)+S(C|A,B)$.

First of all we find out what will be the change in the cost of state merging if we discard a quantum system through a measurement process. Then we relate the change in the cost of state merging with residual correlation δ_{RC}. First of all we simulate an arbitrary quantum operation ε (including measurement) on B. For that, we initially bring in a pure state D ($|0\rangle$) in proximity to the qubit B (see Fig 3). We assume that U is a unitary interaction between B and D. Here primes are used denote the state of the systems after U has acted upon. We have $S(AC,B)=S(AC,BD)$ as D starts with product state with ACB. We also have $I(AC:BD)=I(A'C':B'D')$ as there is no change in the total correlation of the system as result of unitary interaction. Since discarding quantum systems cannot increase the mutual information, $I(A'C':B')\leq I(A'C':B'D')=I(AC:BD)=I(AC:B)$. In other words in terms of conditional entropy we can say at most, $S(A'C'|B')\geq S(AC|B)$. However, from this we can not conclude whether $S(A'|B')\leq S(A|B)$ or $S(A'|B')\geq S(A|B)$. The change in the cost of state merging is captured by the quantity $\Delta_1=S(A'|B')-S(A|B)$. The state of ρ_{ABC} after measurement on the sub system B changes to ${\rho_{ABC}}'=\sum_j p_j\rho_{A|j}\otimes\pi_j^B\otimes\rho_{C|j}$ (where π_j is the projection operator). Hence $S(A'|B')=S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B})$ and $S(A|B)=S(\rho_{AB})-S(\rho_B)$.

Next we consider the case when instead of one particle measurement, we carry out two particle measurement.



FIG. 3: Simulating an arbitrary quantum operation ε (including measurement) on B by bringing in a pure state D ($|0\rangle$) in proximity to the qubit B

For that we simulate an arbitrary quantum operation ε (including measurement) on B and A. We bring in an ancilla D which is initially in a pure state $|0\rangle$ (see Fig 4). Here U once again is the unitary interaction between B, A and D. Since D is in a complete product state with the rest of the system, it does not contribute to the entropy of the system. We have $S(C,AB)=S(C,ABD)$. Since unitary interaction does not change the total correlation of the system we have, $I(C:ABD)=I(C':A'B'D')$. As we know, by discarding quantum system can not increase the mutual information, we have $I(C':A'B')\leq I(C':A'B'D')=I(C:ABD)=I(C:AB)$. Equivalently, we can write $S(C'|A'B')\geq S(C|AB)$. Hence, the change in the cost of state merging $\Delta_2=S(C'|A'B')-S(C|AB)$ is a positive quantity. In other words, discarding prior information increases the cost of state merging. Similarly, the state of ρ_{ABC} after measurement on the subsystem AB changes to ${\rho_{ABC}}'=\sum_j p_j\pi_j^{AB}\otimes\rho_{C|j}$ (where π_j are two particle projection operators). Hence $S(C'|A'B')=S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}})$ and and $S(C|AB)=S(\rho_{ABC})-S(\rho_{AB})$.



FIG. 4: Simulating an arbitrary quantum operation ε (including measurement) on B and A by bringing in a pure state D ($|0\rangle$) in proximity to these qubits

Therefore, the total change in the cost of state merging after carrying out both types measurement is the sumtotal of the change in the cost in each of these individual measurements. This total change in the cost is given by, $\Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 = S(A'|B') - S(A|B) + S(C'|A'B') - S(C|AB)$.
Next we relate this total change in the cost of state merging in terms of the residual correlation. We present this result in the following lemma and its corollary.

Lemma 2. *Let Δ be the total change in the cost of state merging for three parties after measurements are performed. Then, $D_{RC} = \Delta$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} D_{RC} &= \mathcal{I}_2(A:B:C) - \mathcal{I}_1(A:B:C) \\ &= S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) - S(\rho_{ABC}) + S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}) \\ &= S(\rho_{C|\Pi_j^{AB}}) - S(\rho_{ABC}) + S(\rho_{AB}) \\ &\quad - S(\rho_{AB}) + S(\rho_B) + S(\rho_{A|\Pi_j^B}) \\ &= S(C'|A'B') - S(C|AB) - S(A|B) + S(A'|B') \\ &= \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3. *Let Δ be the total change in the cost of state merging for three parties after measurements are performed. Then, $\delta_{RC} \leq \Delta$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, we have $D_{RC} = \Delta$. Since $\delta_{RC} = \min_{\pi_j}(D_{RC})$, we have $\delta_{RC} \leq \Delta$.

□

This is indeed a remarkable feature as the total change in the cost of state merging is captured by the residual correlation present in the system. In Fig 5 we have plotted the total change of the cost of state merging (the residual correlation function) with respect to the mixedness of the system (which is given by $Tr(\rho^2)$) and found that this quantity in principle can take positive, negative and zero values. For states with positive residual correlation there is increase in the cost of state merging. For states with zero residual correlation, there is no increase in the cost of state merging. Negative residual correlation indicates that there has been a decrease in the cost of state merging. This result shows that for certain quantum states by discarding relevant prior information we can bring down the cost of state merging. This is quite counter intuitive as compared to two qubit systems.



FIG. 5: The total change of the cost of state merging $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$ (the residual correlation D_{RC}) vs $Tr(\rho^2)$ vs Basis parameter (θ). The total change of the cost of state merging $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$ (the residual correlation D_{RC}) of randomly generated 3×10^5 two qubit mixed states ρ is plotted against $Tr(\rho^2)$ and basis parameter (θ).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors acknowledge Dr Nilanjana Dutta for useful discussions. Authors thank Mr. Avijit Misra for his help in certain technical areas.

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
[2] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox, Physics **1**, 3, 195200 (1964); J. S. Bell, On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38**, 447 (1966); J. S. Bell, Introduction to the hidden variable question, Proceedings of the International School of Physics 'Enrico Fermi', Course IL, Foundations of Quantum Mechanics (1971) 17181; J. S. Bell, Bertlmann's socks and the nature of reality, Journal de Physique, Colloque C2, suppl. au numero 3, Tome 42 (1981) pp C2 4161.
[3] W. B. Gao, et al. Nature Physics **6**, 331 - 335 (2010); C.Y. Lu, et al. Nature Physics **3**, 91 - 95 (2007);
[4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Creapeau, R. Jozsa, A. Pares and W. K. Wooters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
[5] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel and H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002); M. Hillery, V. Buzek and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A. **59**, 1829 (1999); S.k. Sazim, C. Vanarasa, I. Chakrabarty, and K. Srinathan, arXiv:1311.5378; S.k. Sazim and I. Chakrabarty, Eur. Phys. J. D **67**, 8 (2013) 174; S.Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, Quantum Information and Computation, **12**, 0253 (2012).
[6] C. H. Bennett and S. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 433 (1992).
[7] A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A. **63**, 014320-1 (2001); C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal and W. K. Wooters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 077902 (2001).
[8] S. Adhikari and B. S. Choudhury, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 032323 (2006); I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhary arXiv:0804.2568; I. Chakrabarty, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **7**, 559 (2009); S. Adhikari, A.S. Majumdar and N. Nayak,

Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042301 (2008); I. Ghiu, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012323 (2003); S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty and B. S. Choudhary, J. Phys. A **39**, 8439 (2006); S. Chatterjee, S. Sazim, I. Chakrabarty, No Broadcasting of Quantum Correlation , arXiv:1411.4397.

[9] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Winter,Nature **436**, 673-676 (2005).

[10] G. Vidal, R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002).

[11] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022(1997).

[12] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).

[13] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998);A. Datta et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008); S.L. Braunstein et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999); D.A. Meyer, ibid. **85**, 2014 (2000); S.L. Braunstein and A.K. Pati, Quant. Inf. Comp. **2**, 399 (2002); A. Datta et al., Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042316 (2005); A. Datta and G. Vidal, ibid. **75**, 042310 (2007); B.P. Lanyon et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200501 (2008).

[14] H. Ollivier, W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002); L. Henderson, V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001); S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).

[15] A.R. Usha Devi, A. K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 140502 (2008); A. Datta, A. Shaji, C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008); K. Modi *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010); M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, B. Synak-Radtke, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062307 (2005).

[16] I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, A. K. Pati, Eur. Phys. J. D **57**, 265 (2010) .

[17] K. Modi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 080501 (2010);M. Okrasa and Z. Walczak, arXiv:1101.6057; C.C. Rulli and M.S. Sarandy, arXiv:1105.2548; Z.-H. Ma and Z.-H. Chen, arXiv:1108.4323.

[18] B. Dakic, V. Vedral, C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010);D. Girolami, G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 150403 (2010).

[19] D. Slepian, J. K. Wolf,IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **19**, 461480 (1971).

[20] N Dutil and P Hayden. One-shot multiparty state merging. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, **69**, 2881, (2010).

[21] V. Madhok, A Datta, Phys. Rev. A, **83**, 032323 (2011).